A.S.	ase 8:11-cv-01242-JST -MLG Document 1 F	Filed 08/19/11 Page 1 of 20 Page ID #:1		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Garo Mardirossian, Esq., #101812  garo@garolaw.com Armen Akaragian, Esq., #242303  aakaragian@garolaw.com  MARDIROSSIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC  A Professional Law Corporation  6311 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90048-5001  Telephone (323) 653-6311  Facsimile (323) 651-5511  Thomas E. Beck, Esq., #81557  becklaw@earthlink.net  THE BECK LAW FIRM  10377 Los Alamitos Boulevard Los Alamitos, CA 90720  Telephone (562) 795-5835  Facsimile (562) 795-5821	2011 AUG 19 PM 3: 28		
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
12				
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
14	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
15				
16	VETH MAM,	Case No.: SACVII-1243-JST (mLGx)		
17	Plaintiff, {	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES		
18	vs.	1. Violation of Civil Rights (42 U.S.C. § 1983)		
19	CITY OF FULLERTON; MICHAEL SELLERS, Chief of Police individually and	2. Monell Claim		
20   21	as a peace officer; KENTON HAMPTON ) #1337, individually and as a peace officer; ) FRANK NGUYEN #1307, individually and)	(42 U.S.C. § 1983)		
22	as a peace officer; JONATHAN W. ) MILLER #1350, individually and as a	3. Conspiracy to Violate Civil Rights (42 U.S.C. § 1985(2))		
23	peace officer; DANIEL SOLORIO #1086, ) DOE REYNOSO # UNKNOWN, DOES 1-1	4. Conspiracy to Violate Civil Rights (42 U.S.C. § 1985(3))		
24	10,	5. Failure to Intervene		
25	Defendants.	(42 U.S.C. § 1986)		
26	}	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL		
27	)			
28				

-1-

#### **JURISDICTION**

1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1343, (1), (2), (3) and (4). This action at law for money damages arises under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the United States Constitution, the laws of the State of California and common law principles to redress a deprivation under color of state law of rights, privileges and immunities secured to Plaintiff by said statutes, and by the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution.

#### **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

- 1. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff VETH MAM was a resident of the County of Los Angeles, City of Baldwin Park, of Cambodian descent.
- 2. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants MICHAEL SELLERS, Chief of Police individually and as a peace officer, KENTON HAMPTON #1337, individually and as a peace officer, FRANK NGUYEN #1307, individually and as a peace officer, JONATHAN W. MILLER #1350, individually and as a peace officer, DANIEL SOLORIO #1086, DOE REYNOSO # UNKNOWN, DOES 1-10, inclusive and each of them, were employees of the City of Fullerton and the Fullerton Police Department. Defendant SELLERS is and all relevant times, the highest ranking law enforcement policymaker for the City of Fullerton.
- 3. Defendant CITY OF FULLERTON (hereinafter referred to as "CITY") is and at all times herein mentioned has been a public entity and an incorporated county duly authorized and existing as such in and under the laws of the State of California; and at all times herein mentioned, Defendant CITY has possessed the power and authority to adopt policies and prescribe rules, regulations and practices affecting the operation of Defendant Fullerton City Police Department, (FPD) and particularly said Department's Patrol, Internal Investigations and Training and Personnel Divisions and other operations and subdivisions presently unidentified to Plaintiff, and their tactics, methods, practices, customs and usages related to internal investigations, personnel supervision and records

maintenance, the use and deployment of dangerous weapons, the use of force, and powers of arrest by its rank and file.

- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the Defendants designated as a DOE is intentionally and negligently responsible in some manner for the events and happenings herein referred to, and thereby proximately caused injuries and damages as herein alleged. The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and each of them, are not now known to Plaintiff who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names and will be added to this action as provided by California Code of Civil Procedure Section 484.
- 5. Defendants, and each of them, did the acts and omissions hereinafter alleged in bad faith and with knowledge that their conduct violated well established and settled law.
- 6. The incidents complained of began in the City of Fullerton, Saturday October 23, 2010. At approximately 2:00 a.m., Plaintiff MAM witnessed Fullerton PD officer JONATHAN MILLER interacting with Sokha Leng in the area of 100 West Amerige Avenue. Plaintiff MAM began to video record what MILLER was doing to Leng. Defendant HAMPTON witnessed MAM filming MILLER's abusing Leng and attacked MAM, knocking the video recorder from MAM's possession to prevent video evidence adverse to MILLER from being captured. MAM was seized by HAMPTON as MAM's video recorder was picked up by another person (TIM) who continued to film HAMPTON's seizure of MAM, MILLER's abuse of Leng and the arrival of Defendants NGUYEN, SOLORIO and REYNOSO. MAM was transported to the Fullerton Police Department without having committed any public offense and without consent.

To corruptly justify MAM's arrest, and further to shield HAMPTON's wrongful assault of MAM, Defendants MILLER, FRANK NGUYEN, DANIEL SOLORIO, DOE REYNOSO and DOES 1-10 conspired to write and file willfully false crime and arrest reports intentionally omitting HAMPTON's involvement with MAM entirely. In furtherance of this conspiracy, NGUYEN wrote a report in which he falsely

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

claimed to have arrived at the scene to assist MILLER and witnessed Plaintiff MAM "jump on Officer Miller's back" and "wrap his hands around Officer J. Miller's neck and tried to choke him" and in defense of MILLER, NGUYEN claimed he pulled MAM off Miller's back and pushed MAM away, knowing NGUYEN and his partner had not yet arrived on the scene when MAM was assaulted by HAMPTON and that MAM at no time jumped on Miller's back or attempted to choke Miller or in any unlawful manner assist Leng. In furtherance of the conspiracy to justify MAM's seizure and assault by HAMPTON, and to support the suppression of HAMPTON, Defendant SOLORIO wrote a police report in which he falsely claimed he'd witnessed Defendant NGUYEN take MAM into custody with Defendant REYNOSO for allegedly attacking MILLER. For his part, HAMPTON filed a police report in which he completely omitted his assault and arrest of MAM, claiming to have arrived on scene with Corporal Contino in time to witness Miller fighting with Leng. To complete his part in the conspiracy, MILLER wrote and filed a crime and arrest report in which he falsely represented MAM "came up behind me and grabbed me, attempting to pull me off Leng." MILLER also falsely wrote that while MILLER "was on top of Leng, MAM came up from behind me and grabbed me around the neck in an attempt to strangle me"; that MILLER "pushed MAM away" and took "Leng in a carotid restraint when NGUYEN arrived"; that MAM "was grabbing me in my back again attempting to pull me off Leng" whereupon "NGUYEN grabbed MAM and pulled him off of me;" and "NGUYEN arrested MAM." MILLER's report was written with the knowledge MAM had at no time touched MILLER or attempted in any manner to unlawfully assist Leng and that HAMPTON, not NGUYEN, arrested MAM.

Said crime reports was designed to mislead the Orange County District Attorney into filing criminal misdemeanor charges against the Plaintiff and became the moving force behind the filing of a four-count Complaint assigned Case No. 10 MN14330 on November 17, 2010. Plaintiff was charged with allegedly violating Penal Code Sections 148, 241 and 243 in which Defendant MILLER was the alleged victim.

Defendants KENTON HAMPTON, FRANK NGUYEN, JONATHAN W. MILLER, DANIEL SOLORIO, DOE REYNOSO and DOES 1-10, continued to willfully mislead the Orange County District Attorney into believing Plaintiff had committed these offenses and if called as witnesses, would provide the testimony to support the prosecution and conviction of the Plaintiff. In furtherance of the conspiracy to deprive the Plaintiff of his constitutional rights, between June 30, 2011 and July 7, 2011, MILLER and NGUYEN gave knowingly false sworn testimony claiming they witnessed the Plaintiff commit the manufactured offenses and denied HAMPTON had anything to do with MAM. Defendants' corruption was exposed by the introduction of MAM's video recording and on July 7, 2011, Plaintiff was found not guilty of all charges.

Defendant SELLERS and Orange County District Attorney Reed was made

aware of Plaintiff's unlawful arrest prior to the commencement of MAM's trial by TIM's and MAM's video recording having been given to Reed but SELLERS willfully failed and refused to discipline, prosecute or otherwise hold any of his subordinates accountable for the felonies they committed against MAM in violation of California law.

Notwithstanding CITY OF FULLERTON's and SELLERS knowledge that Defendants, and particularly HAMPTON, had on numerous other prior and subsequent occasions falsely accused others of crimes against themselves or other police officers, assaulted and battered third parties and engaged in repeated acts of dishonesty and violence, no officer involved in the gross misconduct has ever been held responsible for the criminal wrongdoing by Defendants recited above as of the date of this complaint nor has any police department employee who participated in the conspiracy to falsely arrest and prosecute Plaintiff has been disciplined, prosecuted or otherwise made to be accountable for their unlawful conduct.

#### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

# (VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS - EXCESSIVE FORCE, FALSE ARREST, MALICIOUS PROSECUTION AND CONSPIRACY - 42 U.S.C. § 1983)

(By Plaintiff Against All Individual Defendants)

- 7. Plaintiff refers to and re-pleads each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 6 of this complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein and make each a part hereof.
- 8. This action at law for money damages arises under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the United States Constitution, the laws of the State of California and common law principles to redress a deprivation under color of state law of rights, privileges and immunities secured to Plaintiff by said statutes, and by the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution.
- 9. Commencing at or about the aforementioned date and place, without cause or justification, and acting under color of law, Defendants KENTON HAMPTON, FRANK NGUYEN, JONATHAN W. MILLER, DANIEL SOLORIO, DOE REYNOSO, DOES 1-10 and each of them, intentionally and maliciously deprived Plaintiff of rights secured to him by the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution in that Defendants and each of them, subjected Plaintiff to unreasonable force, unlawful arrest, groundless criminal prosecution and a cover-up conspiracy.
- 10. Defendants, and each of them, carried out and perpetrated the mutually supportive conspiracy to deprive Plaintiff of his rights by participating in a corrupt effort to illegally seize, book, and fraudulently convict Plaintiff on false charges manufactured and supported by Defendants.
- 11. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff sustained great physical and mental pain and shock to his nervous system, fear, anxiety, torment, degradation and emotional distress.
- 12. By reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff incurred medical and therapeutic expenses in an amount as proved.

- 13. In addition, by reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was kept from attending to his usual occupations, and has suffered loss and impairment of earnings and employment opportunities all to his damage in an amount as proved.
- 14. By reason of the aforementioned acts of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was compelled to secure the services of an attorney at law to redress the wrongs hereinbefore mentioned and by virtue thereof, Plaintiff is indebted and liable for attorney's fees.
- 15. The aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants were committed by each of them knowingly, willfully and maliciously, with the intent to harm, injure, vex, harass and oppress Plaintiff with a conscious disregard of Plaintiff's constitutional rights and by reason thereof, Plaintiff seeks punitive and exemplary damages from Defendants, and each of them, (except Defendant CITY) in an amount as proved.

#### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### (UNLAWFUL CUSTOM AND PRACTICE UNDER SECTION 1983)

(By Plaintiff Against Defendants CITY & SELLERS individually)

- 16. Plaintiff refers to and re-pleads each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 15 of this complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein and make each a part hereof.
- 17. Defendant CITY is and at all times herein mentioned has been a public entity and an incorporated municipality duly authorized and existing as such in and under the laws of the State of California; and at all times herein mentioned, Defendant CITY, possessed the power and authority to adopt policies and prescribe rules, regulations and practices affecting the operation of the Fullerton Police Department and its tactics, methods, practices, customs and usages related to internal investigations, personnel supervision and records maintenance, and the proper uses of force by its rank and file, generally.

- 18. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were employees acting under the CITY's direction and control, who knowingly and intentionally promulgated, maintained, applied, enforced and suffered the continuation of policies, customs, practices and usages in violation of the First, Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments respectively to the United States Constitution, which customs, policies, practices and usages at all times herein mentioned required and encouraged the employment, deployment and retention of persons as peace officers who have demonstrated their brutality, dishonesty, bigotry, and numerous other serious abuses of their powers as peace officers in the employment of the CITY.
- 19. Defendant CITY knowingly maintains and permits official *sub-rosa* policies or customs of permitting the occurrence of the kinds of wrongs set forth above, by deliberate indifference to widespread police abuses, failing and refusing to impartially investigate, discipline or prosecute peace officers who commit acts of felonious dishonesty and crimes of violence, each ratified and approved by CITY, FPD and SELLERS.
- 20. The unconstitutional policies, practices or customs promulgated, sanctioned or tolerated by Defendants CITY, FPD and SELLERS include, but are not limited to:
- (1) Defendants CITY and SELLERS had knowledge, prior to and since this incident, of repeated allegations of abuse and assaultive misconduct toward detainees and arrestees. Specifically, CITY and SELLERS knew Defendants had in the past committed acts of police abuse, dishonesty and prevarication;
- (2) Defendants CITY and SELLERS had knowledge, prior to and since this incident, of similar allegations of abuse and dishonesty by Defendants, and refused to enforce established administrative procedures to insure the safety of detainees and arrestees;
- (3) Defendants CITY and SELLERS refused to adequately discipline individual officers and employees found to have committed similar acts of abuse and misconduct;

4

9 10

12 13

11

14 15

17

18

16

19

20

21 22

24 25

23

26 27

- (4) Defendants CITY and SELLERS refused to competently and impartially investigate allegations of abuse and misconduct alleged to have been committed by Fullerton Police Department officers;
- (5) Defendants CITY and SELLERS reprimanded, threatened, intimidated, demoted and fired officers who reported acts of abuse by other officers;
- (6)Defendants CITY and SELLERS covered up acts of misconduct and abuse by Fullerton Police Department officers and sanctioned a code of silence by and among officers;
- (7) Defendants CITY and SELLERS rewarded officers who displayed aggressive and abusive behavior towards detainees and arrestees;
- Defendants CITY and SELLERS failed to adequately train and (8) educate officers in the use of reasonable and proper force and failed to enforce the department's written regulations with respect to uses of force;
- Defendant CITY and SELLERS failed to adequately supervise the (9)actions of officers under their control and guidance;
- (10) Defendants CITY and SELLERS condoned and participated in the practice of prosecuting known groundless criminal charges for the purpose of insulating the CITY of FULLERTON, FPD and its officers from civil liability and reducing or dismissing criminal charges against individuals in return for release from civil liability;
- (11) Defendants CITY and SELLERS condone and encourage a conspiracy of silence among their employees for the purpose of concealing and furthering wrongful and illegal conduct by their employees;
- (12) Defendants CITY, FPD and SELLERS engaged in the practice and custom of withholding from criminal defendants, judges and prosecutors, known Brady evidence unfavorable to their officers in violation of law and the Constitution.
- (13) Defendants CITY, FPD and SELLERS fostered and encouraged an atmosphere of lawlessness, abuse and unconstitutional misconduct, which by October

2010 and thereafter, represented the unconstitutional policies, practices and customs of the CITY.

21. By reason of the aforesaid policies, customs, practices and usages, Plaintiff's rights under the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution were deprived.

#### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### (VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1985 (2))

(By Plaintiff Against All Individual Defendants)

- 22. Plaintiff refers to and re-pleads each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 21 of this complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein and makes each a part hereof.
- 23. Commencing on October 23, 2010 and thereafter, Defendants and two or more of them, in the State of California, County of Orange, by reason of Defendants' animus against minorities, including Asian Americans and Cambodians of which class Plaintiff belongs, invidiously discriminated and conspired together to act and to fail to act as hereinbefore alleged, for the purpose of impeding, hindering, obstructing, and defeating the due course of justice in the State of California and County of Orange.
- 24. Defendants, and each of them, purposefully, under color of law, planned and conspired to deny Plaintiff equal protection of the laws by (a) denying the right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure; and (b) denying the right not to be deprived of property and liberty without due process of law.
- 25. By virtue of the foregoing, Defendants, and each of them, violated 42 U.S.C. § 1985 (2).
- 26. As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing, Plaintiff has been damaged as recited above and demands and is entitled to the damages recited in the First Cause of Action, including but not limited to, general and punitive damages (except as to Defendant CITY) and attorney's fees.

#### 

#### 

# 

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### (VIOLATION OF 42 § 1985 (3))

(By Plaintiff Against All Individual Defendants)

- 27. Plaintiff refers to and re-pleads each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 26 of this complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein and makes each a part hereof.
- 28. By virtue of the foregoing, Defendants and two or more of them, conspired for the purpose of depriving Plaintiff of (a) equal protection of the law; and (b) equal protection and immunities under the law; and for the purpose of preventing and hindering the constituted authorities from giving and securing to Plaintiff equal protection of the law an deprivation of liberty and property without due process of law.
- 29. Defendants, and each of them, did and caused to be done, an act or acts in furtherance of the object of the conspiracy, whereby Plaintiff was deprived of the rights and privileges as set forth above.
- 30. As a direct proximate result of the foregoing, Plaintiff has been damaged as recited above and demands and is entitled to the damages recited in the First Cause of Action, including, but not limited to, general and punitive damages (except as to Defendant CITY) and attorney's fees.

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### (VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1986)

(By Plaintiff Against All Individual Defendants)

- 31. Plaintiff refers to and re-pleads each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 30 of this complaint, and by this reference incorporates the same herein and makes each a part hereof.
- 32. Commencing on October 23, 2010, Defendants, and each of them knew and understood Plaintiff was being subjected to a deprivation of his constitutional rights and

were in the position and had the duty and authority to intervene to prevent the bonning wrongdoing committed against Plaintiff by Defendants. 2 By virtue of the foregoing, Defendants, and each of them, violated 42 U.S.C. 3 33. § 1986. 4 As a direct and proximate result of the foregoing, Plaintiff has been damaged 5 34. as recited above and demands and is entitled to the damages recited in the First Cause of 6 Action, including, but not limited to, general and punitive damages (except as to 7 Defendant CITY) and attorney's fees. 8 9 10 **PRAYER** WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants and each of them, as 11 12 follows: AS TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION AS APPLICABLE 13 For General damages according to proof; 14 1. For Special damages according to proof; 15 2. For Punitive damages as provided by law, in an amount to be proved against 16 3. each individual Defendant; 17 For attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C § 1988; 18 4. For Costs of suit; 5. 19 For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper. 20 6. 21 Dated: August 19, 2011 MARDIROSSIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC. 22 23 By: 24 Garo Mardirossian, Esq. 25 Armen Akaragian, Esq. 26 Lawrence D. Marks, Esq. 27

Attorneys for Plaintiff

1 2	PLAINTIFF'S JURY DEMAND		
3	Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury.		
4			
5	Dated: August 19, 2011	MARDIROSSIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.	
6			
7	T	Bv. Mardin-	
8	ŀ	By: Mardirossian, Esq.	
9		Armen Akaragian, Esq.	
10		Lawrence D. Marks, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff	
11		<i>y</i>	
12			
13			
14			
15 16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
А			

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Josephine Tucker and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Marc Goldman.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

SACV11- 1242 JST (MLGx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

ll discovery related motions s	siloula de IIC	on the ca	lendar of th	e Magist	rate Judge

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is

Western Division
312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8
Los Angeles, CA 90012

[X] Southern Division
411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053
Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Central District of California

VETH MAM	)
Plaintiff v. CITY OF FULLERTON, (See Attachment)	Civil Action No. SACVII-1242-JST(MG)
Defendant	, and the second

#### SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) CITY OF FULLERTON, 303 West Commonwealth, Fullerton, CA 92832

MICHAEL SELLERS, KENTON HAMPTON #1337, FRANK NGUYEN #1307, JONATHAN W. MILLER #1350, DANIEL SOLORIO #1086, DOE REYNOSO #UNKNOWN, 237 West Commonwealth, Fullerton, CA 92832

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 lays after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Garo Mardirossian, Esq., MARDIROSSIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
6311 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90048-5001

Thomas E. Beck, Esq., THE BECK LAW FIRM 10377 Los Alamitos Boulevard, Los Alamitos, CA 90720

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

Date: AUG 1 9 2011

CLERK OF COURT

MASEA DAVIS

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

This summons for (name	of individual and title, if any)	The second secon	
received by me on (date)	·	(RYSETTING HOLD	
☐ I personally served the	ne summons on the individual at	t (place)	
		on (date)	; or
☐ I left the summons at	the individual's residence or us	sual place of abode with (name)	
	, a person o	f suitable age and discretion who resi	des there,
on (date)	, and mailed a copy to the	ne individual's last known address; or	r
☐ I served the summon	S On (name of individual)		, who is
designated by law to ac	cept service of process on behal	f of (name of organization)	
	N. Committee of the com	on (date)	; or
☐ I returned the summo	ons unexecuted because		; or
Other (specify):			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information i	s true.	
		Server's signature	
		Printed name and title	
	WHITE CO. 1. T.	Server's address	

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

## **ATTACHMENT TO SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION**

MICHAEL SELLERS, Chief of Police individually and as a peace officer, KENTON HAMPTON #1337, individually and as a peace officer, FRANK NGUYEN #1307, individually and as a peace officer, JONATHAN W. MILLER #1350, individually and as a peace officer, DANIEL SOLORIO #1086, DOE REYNOSO #UNKNOWN, DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

CIVIL COVER SHEET Case 8:11-cv-01242-JST -MLG Document 1 Filed 08/19/11 Page 18 of 20 Page ID #:18 I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) DEFENDANTS **VETH MAM** CITY OF FULLERTON, (See Attachment) (b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are representing Attorneys (If Known) yourself, provide same.) Garo Mardirossian, Esq., MARDIROSSIAN & ASSOCIATES, INC., 6311 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90048-5001, (323) 653-6311 Thomas E. Beck, Esq., THE BECK LAW FIRM, 10377 Los Alamitos Boulevard II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.) 795-5835 III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only (Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.) ■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. □ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff PTF DEF PTF DEF Government Not a Party) Citizen of This State  $\square$  1  $\Box$  1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4  $\Box 4$ of Business in this State ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship Citizen of Another State  $\square 2$  $\square$  2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 □ 5 of Parties in Item III) of Business in Another State Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country 3  $\square$  3 Foreign Nation  $\Box$  6 □ 6 IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.) ■ 1 Original  $\square$  2 Removed from  $\square$  3 Remanded from ☐ 4 Reinstated or ☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify): ☐ 6 Multi-☐ 7 Appeal to District Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened District Judge from Magistrate Judge Litigation V. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: Yes \( \text{No (Check 'Yes' only if demanded in complaint.)} \) CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: ☐ Yes ₩ No MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT: \$ According to proof VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) Violation of Civil Rights (42 U.S.C. § 1983); Monell Claim (42 U.S.C. § 1983), Conspiracy to Violate Civil Rights (42 U.S.C. § 1985(2), etc.) VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.) OTHER STATUTES CONTRACT **TORTS** TORTS **PRISONER** LABOR PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 400 State Reapportionment □ 110 Insurance PERSONAL **PETITIONS** □ 710 Fair Labor Standards □ 310 Airplane □ 410 Antitrust ☐ 120 Marine PROPERTY □ 510 Motions to Act ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 315 Airplane Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud Vacate Sentence □ 720 Labor/Mgmt. □ 450 Commerce/ICC ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability □ 371 Truth in Lending Habeas Corpus Relations □ 320 Assault, Libel & Rates/etc. ☐ 150 Recovery of ☐ 380 Other Personal □ 530 General ☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt. Slander ☐ 460 Deportation Overpayment & Property Damage ☐ 535 Death Penalty □ 330 Fed. Employers' Reporting & ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced Enforcement of Property Damage □ 540 Mandamus/ Disclosure Act Liability and Corrupt Judgment Product Liability Other □ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 340 Marine ☐ 151 Medicare Act Organizations BANKRUPTCY ☐ 550 Civil Rights □ 345 ☐ 790 Other Labor Marine Product ☐ 480 Consumer Credit □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC ☐ 555 Prison Condition Liability Litigation ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV Student Loan (Excl. 158 FORFEITURE / □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. □ 810 Selective Service Veterans) ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 Security Act □ 355 Motor Vehicle PENALTY □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ □ 153 Recovery of USC 157 □ 610 Agriculture Product Liability PROPERTY RIGHTS Exchange Overpayment of □ 360 **CIVIL RIGHTS** ☐ 620 Other Food & Other Personal □ 820 Copyrights □ 875 Customer Challenge 12 Veteran's Benefits ☐ 441 Voting Injury Drug □ 830 Patent □ 160 Stockholders' Suits USC 3410 ☐ 442 Employment □ 362 Personal Injury-☐ 625 Drug Related □ 840 Trademark ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 190 Other Contract 443 Housing/Acco-Med Malpractice Seizure of SOCIAL SECURITY □ 891 Agricultural Act □ 195 Contract Product ☐ 365 Personal Injurymmodations Property 21 USC □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 892 Economic Stabilization Liability Product Liability Welfare 881 ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 196 Franchise Act □ 368 Asbestos Personal ☐ 445 American with ☐ 630 Liquor Laws □ 863 DIWC/DIWW □ 893 Environmental Matters REAL PROPERTY Injury Product Disabilities -☐ 640 R.R. & Truck (405(g))□ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 210 Land Condemnation Liability **Employment** ☐ 650 Airline Regs ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 895 Freedom of Info. Act □ 220 Foreclosure **IMMIGRATION** ☐ 446 American with ☐ 660 Occupational □ 865 RSI (405(g)) □ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi-☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 462 Naturalization Disabilities -Safety /Health FEDERAL TAX SUITS nation Under Equal ☐ 240 Torts to Land Application Other □ 690 Other □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff Access to Justice ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability Habeas Corpus-440 Other Civil or Defendant) ☐ 290 All Other Real Property □ 950 Constitutionality of Alien Detainee Rights ☐ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 □ 465 Other Immigration State Statutes USC 7609 Actions

WALDINICI OF CALIFORNIA

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDE	NTICAL CASES: Has to number(s):	his action been pre-	viously filed in this court an	d dismissed, remanded or closed? ■No □ Yes	
	ATED CASES: Have a number(s):		iously filed in this court that	t are related to the present case? ♥No □ Yes	
	□ B. C. □ C. Fe	rise from the same all for determination or other reasons wo	or closely related transaction on of the same or substantiall ould entail substantial duplic	ns, happenings, or events; or by related or similar questions of law and fact; or ation of labor if heard by different judges; or and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.	
IX. VENUE:	(When completing the f	ollowing information	on, use an additional sheet if	necessary.)	
(a) List the C	County in this District; Core if the government, its	alifornia County ou agencies or employ	atside of this District; State is yees is a named plaintiff. If	f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. this box is checked, go to item (b).	
County in thi				California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
Orange County					
				f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which <b>EACH</b> named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).	
County in th				California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
Unknown, incident took place in Orange County					
			utside of this District; State in of the tract of land invol	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which <b>EACH</b> claim arose.	
County in th	is District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
Orange Cou					
* Los Angelo Note: In land	es, Orange, San Bernard condemnation cases, use	the location of the	entura, Santa Barbara, or tract of land involved	San Luis Obispo Counties	
X. SIGNATI	URE OF ATTORNEY (C	OR PRO PER):	Mals	Date August 19, 2011	
or other but is us	papers as required by law sed by the Clerk of the Co	CV-71 (JS-44) Ci This form, approve ourt for the purpose	ivil Cover Sheet and the info ved by the Judicial Conference of statistics, venue and initia	rmation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings ce of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ting the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)	
Key to Statist	tical codes relating to Soc	cial Security Cases:			
	Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	f Cause of Action	
	861	HIA	All claims for health insu Also, include claims by h program. (42 U.S.C. 193	rance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. ospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the 5FF(b))	
	862	BL	All claims for "Black Lur (30 U.S.C. 923)	ng" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.	
	863	DIWC		d workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))	
	863	DIWW	All claims filed for widow Act, as amended. (42 U.S.	ws or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security S.C. 405(g))	
	864	SSID	All claims for supplemen Act, as amended.	tal security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security	
	865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))		

CV 71 (05/00)

## ATTACHMENT TO CIVIL COVER SHEET

MICHAEL SELLERS, Chief of Police individually and as a peace officer, KENTON HAMPTON #1337, individually and as a peace officer, FRANK NGUYEN #1307, individually and as a peace officer, JONATHAN W. MILLER #1350, individually and as a peace officer, DANIEL SOLORIO #1086, DOE REYNOSO #UNKNOWN, DOES 1-10,

Defendants.